



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,051	04/18/2006	Darren James Mansfield	P/3610-65	2072
2352	7590	03/27/2009	EXAMINER	
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 100368403			MORRIS, PATRICIA L	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		1625	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		03/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/566,051	MANSFIELD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patricia L. Morris	1625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-17 and 19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-12, 18, 20 and 21 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/25/06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-12, 18, 20 and 21 are under consideration in this application.

Claims 13-17 and 19 are held withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to nonelected subject matter 37 CFR 1.142(b).

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, compound 5 in the table on page 33 of the specification and process A on page 38 of the specification in the reply filed on January 12, 2009 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that all the claimed processes relate to the commonly claimed class of compounds. This is not found persuasive because for the reasons clearly set forth in the previous Office action. Moreover, the claimed compounds do not make any contribution to the prior art as evidenced by the prior art of record.

Clearly 37 CFR 1.475 means one when they say a. See the commentary on the rules, 1134 OG 194-209. Note specifically, p. 1134 O.G. 197, col. 2 paragraph numbered (6). PCT Rule 13 provides "claims are permitted to one product, one process of manufacturing the product, and one use of the product". If multiple products, process of manufacture or uses are claimed, the first invention in the category first mentioned in the claims would be considered as the elected invention".

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-12, 18, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mansfield et al. (WO 2004/016088).

Mansfield et al. disclose the claimed compounds and process of preparing. Note, for example, compound nos. A-1 -A-9, etc., in Table A and the preparation examples on pages 23-24 therein. Hence, the instant compounds and process of preparing are deemed to be anticipated therefrom.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention “by another,” or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the

various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-12, 18, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mansfield et al.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention “by another”; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Mansfield et al. generically embrace the claimed compounds and disclose the claimed process of preparing. Note, compound nos. A-1-A-9, etc., in Table A and the reaction scheme set forth on pages 3-5 therein.

It is believed that one having ordinary skill in the art would have found the claimed compounds *prima facie* obvious, since they are generically embraced by the disclosed formula; *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971). See also *In re Malagari*, 499 F.2d 1297, 182 USPQ 549 (CCPA 1974); *In re Lemkin*, 332 F.2d 839, 141 USPQ 814 (CCPA 1964); *In re Rosicky*, 276 F.2d 656, 125 USPQ 341 (CCPA 1960).

The requisite motivation for arriving at the claimed compounds stems from the fact that they fall within the generic class of compounds disclosed by Mansfield et al.

Accordingly, one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare any of the compounds embraced by the disclosed generic formula, including those encompassed by the claims, with the expectation that each of them would be suitable as fungicides.

It is believed well settled that a reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably conveyed to one having ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fracalossi*, 681 F.2d 792, 215 USPQ 569 (CCPA 1982); *In re Lamberti*, 545 F.2d 747, 192 USPQ 278 (CCPA 1976); *In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976); *In re Susi*, *supra*.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it

is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The expressions “metallic complexes” and “metalloidic complexes” are employed with considerable abandon in claims 1 and 18 with no indication given as to what complexes really are.

One should be able, from a reading of the claims, determine what that claim does or does not encompass.

Why? Because that claim precludes others from making, using, or selling that compound for 20 years. Therefore, one must know what compound is being claimed.

The specification lacks direction or guidance for placing all of the alleged products in the possession of the public without inviting more than routine experimentation. Applicants are referred to In re Fouche, 169 USPQ 429 CCPA 1971, MPEP 716.02(b).

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is undue. These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art, 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor, 7) the existence of working examples,

and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The nature of the invention

The nature of the invention is the preparation of the claimed compounds.

State of the Prior Art

Metalloidic and metal complexes can have very different properties. Metalloids and metals tend to convert from less stable to more stable forms. No method exists to predict what group will work with any significant certainty.

The amount of direction or guidance and the presence or absence of working examples

The specification fails to describe any metal complexes or metalloid complexes. Metals and metalloids often change into other forms during manufacture. Based on the unpredictability in the art, applicants are not entitled to any and all unknown metallic complexes and metalloidic complexes.

The written description is considered inadequate here in the specification. Conception of the intended complexes should not be the role of the reader. Applicants should, in return for a 20 year monopoly, be disclosing to the public that which they know as an actual demonstrated fact. The disclosure should not be merely an invitation to experiment. This is a 35 USC 112, first paragraph. If you (the public) find that it works, I claim it, is not a proper basis of patentability. In re Kirk, 153 USPQ 48, at page 53.

The breadth of the claims

The breadth of the claims are drawn to all metallic complexes and metalloidic complexes in addition to the instant compounds.

The quantity of experimentation needed

The quantity of experimentation needed would be undue when faced with the lack of direction and guidance present in the instant specification in regards to the compounds and their unknown other forms being claimed.

In terms of the 8 Wands factors, undue experimentation would be required to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure due to the breadth of the claims, the level of unpredictability in the art of the invention, and the poor amount of direction provided by applicants. Taking the above factors into consideration, it is not seen where the instant other forms are enabled by the instant application.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating fungi on crops, does not reasonably provide enablement for the prevention of fungi on crops. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

No enablement can be found in the specification for the prevention of fungi infestation on crops.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The expressions “metallic complexes” and metalloidic complexes” in claim 1 are indefinite.

The expression “which may be” in claim 12 is indefinite because it suggests that the variables have other groups not contemplated by applicants.

The term “general” in claims 1, 12 and 18 is indefinite because it suggests that the compounds have other structures not contemplated by applicants.

The plural ‘s’ on salts, oxides and complexes makes claims 1 and 18 read on mixtures rather than specific compounds.

The claims measure the invention. United Carbon Co. v. Binney & Smith, 55 USPQ 381 at 384, col. 1, end of 1st paragraph, Supreme Court of the United States (1942).

The U.S. Court of Claims held to this standard in Lockheed Aircraft Corp. v. United States, 193 USPQ 449, “Claims measure invention and resolution of invention must be based on what is claimed”.

The C.C.P.A. in 1978 held “that invention is the subject matter defined by the claims submitted by the applicant. We have consistently held that no applicant should have limitations of the specification read into a claim where no express statement of the limitation is included in the claim”: In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11, at 15.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d

2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-11, 20 and 21 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of copending Application No. 10/582,693 in view of Cooke et al.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Ser. No. 10/582,693 disclose compounds that differ only in having an haloalkyl group attached to the pyridine ring rather than a alkyl group. However, Cooke et al. teach the art recognized equivalence of alkyl and haloalkyl on analogous compounds having the same utility. Note column 2, lines 34-37, therein. Hence, the instant compounds are deemed to be obvious optional variants of the compounds disclosed therein. The close structural analogy to the prior art compounds provides the motivation to make and use the claimed compounds. Hence, patentable distinction is not seen.

Claim Objections

Claims 2-11 and 18 are objected to because of the following informalities: The term oxides is misspelled in claims 1 and 18. The term characterized is misspelled in claims 2-11. Appropriate correction is required.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed January 25, 2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Morris whose telephone number is (571) 272-0688. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Patricia L. Morris/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

plm
March 24, 2009

Application/Control Number: 10/566,051
Art Unit: 1625

Page 12